STANDARD FORM NO. 54 Approved For Release 2002/05/08: GIA-RDP59-00882R000100170020-8

## Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OGC Has Reviewed

25X1A9A	to attn	:	0 <b>ff</b> :	ce of	the	Gene	ral	Co	unsel					DATE:	20	J	anuary	1955
	FROM	:	Depu	ity Chi	ef,	Fina	nce	Di	visio	n								
									25X1A	9A								
	SUBJEC	CT :	Coll	.ectior	of	Acco	unt	-										
	De	ice tai	due f	rom su	bjec turn	et in med t	the o mi	a 111	mount tary (	of \$6 luty i	85.9 n Ja	2. muar	Subj ry 19	an ou ject was 954, and	5 a ]	Liv.	litary	
25X1A9A	7119	de	at He	he amo adquar gency.	rters	due at	from the	ti	ubject me of	resu	lted	fro	om ar te	over- erminat	sett: ion	ler o:f	ment duty	
	ex	tai pla	led e	xplana	tion	of ppea	the rs t	ci: tha	rcumst t furt	tances ther c	orre	fter	two	in who attempte will	ots :	t	writt	en o
25X1A9.	wi A re su	Y b .11 ady ffi	asis give to p	to exa satisi resent time	mine acto to	the	evi esul	lde: Lts	nce. and t	We fe ve hav [t is	el t re fu beli	hat ill d .eved	a fa locum l tha	Headquact-to- nentati nt one l answe	face on o day	ez (* 1 (VO)	xplana the ca uld be	se
25X1A9A	he	re	for c	t is p consult of his	atio	n, t	hrou	ıgh	appr	opriat	e mi	lite	ary (	channel			esence that	
		ur	recon	t is mendat	ions	3. T	he F	in	ance 1	Divisi	er ou Lon f	r pr Cile	ropos regs	sed act arding	ion this	enc	d forwase is	ard
												25	X1AŞ	A				

Approved For Release 2002/05/08 : CIA-RDP59-00882R000100170020-8

25 January 1955

	MERCRANGIM FOR: Chairman, Claims Board 25X1A9A
	SUBJECT : Claim for Loss of Personal Property -
	25X1A9A
	25X1A9A
	1. As you requested, we have reviewed Mr claim
9A	in the amount of \$17.770.57 for loss of personal property by a
	fire which occurred in quarters assigned to Hr. at Hayama,
	Japan.
	2. In our opinion the CIA Claims Board may honor claims of
	2. In our opinion the CIA Claims Board may honor claims or its amployees for loss of personal property in circumstances where
	the employee is prevented from pursuing his normal evenues of reli-
	by reason of security considerations arising from his comployment by
	the Agency. We know of no theory, however, under which the
	Covernment may be held to be an insurer against lose to a Federal
	CAMPAGEMENT SEAL DG USTIL II) DG SEI JUNEILGE STREETING TRUNG AG SE EASTAINT
	to said the desire to the said of the said
	combines resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no reclinance on the part of the Government or special circum-
	be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circum- stances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal
	suployee resulting from a normal hemard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circum- stances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circum- stances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remamination if additional evidence were
	suployee resulting from a normal hemard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circum- stances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circum- stances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remamination if additional evidence were
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circum- stances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remamination if additional evidence were
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circum- stances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remamination if additional evidence were
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circumstances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remamination if additional evidence were presented.
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circum- stances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remamination if additional evidence were
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circumstances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remamination if additional evidence were presented.
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circumstances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remamination if additional evidence were presented.  Deputy General Counsel
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circumstances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remomination if additional evidence were presented.  Deputy General Counsel
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circumstances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remamination if additional evidence were presented.  Deputy General Counsel
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circumstances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remomination if additional evidence were presented.  Deputy General Counsel
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circumstances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remomination if additional evidence were presented.  Deputy General Counsel
	be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circumstances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remamination if additional evidence were presented.  Deputy General Counsel
	employee resulting from a normal hazard in which there appears to be no negligence on the part of the Government or special circumstances which might call for legislative relief. We see no legal theory on which the Claims Board could approve this claim. The matter could be subject to remomination if additional evidence were presented.  Deputy General Counsel

25X1

1 - chrono